

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Ravi Subramanian

Application No.: 09/772,584

Confirmation No.: 2348

Filed: January 29, 2001

Art Unit: 2182

For: A WIRELESS SPREAD SPECTRUM
COMMUNICATION PLATFORM USING
DYNAMICALLY RECONFIGURABLE
LOGIC

Examiner: I. Park

REPLY BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This Reply Brief is pursuant to 37 CFR § 41.41(a), and is responsive to the Examiner's Answer mailed on February 23, 2007, in the above identified U.S. Patent application. As required under § 41.41(a), this Reply Brief is filed within two months of the Examiner's Answer.

No fees are believed due for the filing of this Reply Brief. However, if any fee is due, the Patent Office is authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

As described in Appellants' Appeal Brief, each of the claims under final rejection is patentable over the references cited by the Examiner. Appellant maintains each argument presented in the Brief. In particular, Appellant maintains that Sharrit does not teach, or even suggest, a kernel having a local controller that permits the kernel to operate autonomously with respect to other of a plurality of kernels, as required by the claimed invention.

In the "(10) Response to Argument" section part "a.", the Examiner quotes four different portions of Sharrit. Applicant encourages the Board to read each of these four quoted portions in context. Such a reading makes it clear that Sharrit's control lies with the controller 16, which is a single controller located outside of the plurality of RRUs 12. Sharrit does not teach an individual kernel having a local controller that permits the kernel to operate autonomously with respect to other of a plurality of kernels.

In the "(10) Response to Argument" section part "b.", the Examiner quotes three portions of the argument section of Applicant's Appeal Brief, and then states that the asserted features are not recited in the claims. The Examiner seems to misunderstand these portions, as they are technical explanations as to why Sharrit can not teach a kernel having a local controller that permits the kernel to operate autonomously with respect to other of a plurality of kernels.

The other specific arguments relating to the patentability of the claims set forth in the Appeal Brief are maintained.

For at least the reasons set forth above, and those identified in the Appeal Brief, Appellants respectfully submit that the Final Office Action and the Examiner's Answer fail

to even state a *prima facie* case under Section 103. Accordingly, reversal of the final rejection of all claims is respectfully requested..

Dated: March 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant